

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/677,341 10/03/2003		Shin Fujita	116961 8764		
25944	7590 10/05/2005		EXAMINER		
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928			CHUNG, DAVID Y		
	NA, VA 22320		ART UNIT PAPER NUMI		
	•		2871		

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	on No.	Applicant(s)	-			
Office Action Summary		10/677,34	1	FUJITA, SHIN				
		Examiner		Art Unit				
		David Y. C	Chung	2871				
The MAIL Period for Reply	ING DATE of this communicat	ion appears on the	cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addi	ess			
THE MAILING C - Extensions of time rr after SIX (6) MONTH - If the period for reply - If NO period for reply - Failure to reply within Any reply received b	STATUTORY PERIOD FOR ATE OF THIS COMMUNICA way be available under the provisions of 37 IS from the mailing date of this communic specified above is less than thirty (30) day is specified above, the maximum statutor in the set or extended period for reply will, by the Office later than three months after the djustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TION. ' CFR 1.136(a). In no eve ation. ys, a reply within the statu y period will apply and wi by statute, cause the appl	ent, however, may a reply be tim story minimum of thirty (30) days Il expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ication to become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this com D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	· munication.			
Status								
1)⊠ Responsiv	e to communication(s) filed o	n 14 September 2	005.					
· _ ·								
· ·	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Clair	ms							
4a) Of the 5) ☐ Claim(s) _ 6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>1</u> 7) ☑ Claim(s) <u>7</u>	-11 is/are pending in the appl above claim(s) 10 is/are without is/are allowed. -6,8,9 and 11 is/are rejected. is/are objected to. are subject to restriction	drawn from consid						
Application Papers								
9)☐ The specifi	cation is objected to by the Ex	kaminer.						
10)□ The drawin)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant m	ay not request that any objection	n to the drawing(s) b	e held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
<u> </u>	nt drawing sheet(s) including the r declaration is objected to by	•	-,,,,,		• •			
Priority under 35 U	S.C. § 119							
a)⊠ All b)□ 1.⊠ Cert 2.□ Cert 3.□ Cop appl	gment is made of a claim for a Some * c) None of: ified copies of the priority doc ified copies of the priority doc ies of the certified copies of the ication from the International ched detailed Office action for	cuments have bee cuments have bee ne priority docume Bureau (PCT Rule	n received. n received in Application ents have been received 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National S	tage			
Attachment(s)								
1) Notice of Reference	es Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summary		•			
3) 🛛 Information Disclos	son's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-s ure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTC ate <u>14 Se<i>ptember 2005</i>.</u>		Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:		52)			

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1 and 3 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe et al. (U.S. 6,812,984).

As to claims 1, 3 and 11, Watanabe et al. discloses a liquid crystal display in figure 1, having a plurality of scanning lines GL, a plurality of data lines that intersect the scanning lines SL, pixels P disposed in a matrix form to correspond to the intersection of the scanning and data lines, and a thin film transistor as a switching element. Figure 11 shows an identification pattern representing identification information that identifies each of the respective scan lines. This information is formed at the periphery of the display.

Watanabe et al. does not disclose a dummy pixel area. Shirahashi et al. discloses a dummy gate line, dummy data line and dummy pixel electrodes formed on the outermost portion of the display matrix. Shirahashi et al. teaches that by forming these dummy elements, the breaking of the outermost signal lines during etching can be

Art Unit: 2871

reduced. See column 14, lines 15-29. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to form a dummy pixel area to prevent the kind of defects such as signal line breakage.

As to claims 2 and 4, Shirahashi et al. discloses dummy circuit elements on both sides of the display to prevent line breakage on all sides. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide this in the device of Watanabe for the same reason. Watanabe does not disclose dividing the identification pattern to be on both sides. However, this was simply a matter of design choice. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to divide the identification pattern to be on both sides because it was a matter of design choice.

As to claim 5, figure 11 shows the identification pattern being connected to the pixel electrode via the scanning lines. Figure 11 also shows the identification pattern to be smaller than the pixel electrodes.

As to claim 6, figure 11 shows that the identification pattern is formed in the pad area such that it does not overlap with the data lines. It is inherent that the device disclosed by Watanabe contains driving circuits for driving the scanning and data lines since the device would not function otherwise. Figure 1 clearly shows the thin film transistors which function as switching elements.

Art Unit: 2871

As to claims 8 and 9, the identification pattern is formed of the same material as the scanning lines, in this case Cr, Al, or Mo. See column 3, lines 1-5. These metals both shield and reflect light.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 7 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: none of the prior art taught or suggested forming an identification pattern on the counter substrate.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Chung whose telephone number is (571) 272-2288. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.

KËNNETH PARKER PRIMARY EXAMINER